

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **20 March 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-33. Claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed et al. (USPN 6,345,288 hereinafter “Reed”), in view of Bischoff et al. (USPN 6,718,377 hereinafter “Bischoff”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Examiner rejected claims 1-33 as being indefinite. More specifically, the Examiner avers that the claims contain limitations directed at different embodiments of Applicant’s invention. Applicant has amended claims 1, 3-8, 11-12, 14-19, 22-23, 25-30, and 33 to clarify the claim language.

Furthermore, Examiner rejects the independent claims for not clearly claiming features of the second component. More specifically, the Examiner objects to the use of the word “can.” Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30 to remove the word “can.” Note that claim 8 has the second and the third components flipped.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30 were rejected as being unpatentable over Reed in view of Bischoff. Examiner acknowledges in the office action of 20 March 2007, on page 2, paragraph 4 that Reed discloses a single communications object.

In light of the telephone conversation with the Examiner on 10 May 2007, Applicant has amended the independent claims to clarify that the present invention uses two communications objects, a data object and a data transfer session object (DTSO), to facilitate communication between components. This is

advantageous because a component can access a universal interface associated with a data object to obtain a data transfer session object, which is optimized to transfer data with a specific entity (see page 10, paragraph [0031], lines 7-10, and page 15, paragraph [0039], lines 23-page 16, line 2 of the instant application).

Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 1, 3-8, 11-12, 14-19, 22-23, 25-30, and 33 to clarify that embodiments of the present invention employ a data object that implements a universal data transfer interface, which is independent from a data transfer session object that facilitates transfer of data between components. This amendment finds support in FIGs. 7-8, and in paragraphs [0031], [0039], and [0051]-[0057]. Dependent claims 2, 13, and 24 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 9-11, which depend upon claim 8, claims 14-18, which depend upon claim 12, claims 20-22, which depend upon claim 19, claims 25-29, which depend upon claim 23, and claims 31-33, which depend upon claim 30, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /A. Richard Park/
A. Richard Park
Registration No. 41,241

Date: 14 June 2007

A. Richard Park
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1661
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: richard@parklegal.com